UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

AMERICAN FAMILY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,)	
Plaintiff,)	
v.)	1:10-cv-571-TWP-WGH
COLIN M. BETTS, JILL BETTS and USAA,)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS

This matter is before the Court on the Motion for Dismissal filed by Defendant Colin M. Betts ("Mr. Betts") on August 18, 2010. (Docket No. 20). Plaintiff's Response to Defendant Colin Betts' Motion for Dismissal was filed on September 8, 2010. (Docket No. 24). No reply brief has been filed.

The Court, being duly advised, now **DENIES** the Motion for Dismissal under Rule 12.

This motion to dismiss under Rule 12 raises the issue of whether this Court has jurisdiction over Mr. Betts. In paragraph 1 of his Motion for Dismissal, Mr. Betts advises the Court that he maintained his residency in the State of Tennessee, but "at all relevant times" he maintained a "conditional residence" in Indiana. Further, the Court's docket reflects that service was made on Mr. Betts by serving a Summons and Complaint upon him at the Granger, Indiana, address (Docket No. 11) and by mailing a copy to him and

leaving a copy at a Muncie, Indiana, address. Mr. Betts does not deny that he was served

with the Summons and Complaint in this case.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e) provides that federal court will have personal

jurisdiction over a defendant if service is effectuated pursuant to the law of the state where

the district court is located and a summons is delivered to the defendant personally or left at

his usual place of abode with a person of suitable age and discretion. Because Mr. Betts

does not dispute that he actually received the Summons and Complaint, and he admits that

at all relevant times he had at least a "conditional residence" in Indiana, the Court

concludes that due process is not offended by requiring Mr. Betts to defend the claim in this

case. Therefore, the Motion for Dismissal is **DENIED.**

The Court has reviewed the Motion for Dismissal and concludes that in addition to

seeking to dismiss this case for lack of jurisdiction, Mr. Betts raises other issues that would

constitute an answer on his behalf. Therefore, the Court concludes that Defendant Colin M.

Betts' Motion for Dismissal should be considered an Answer that has been filed.

Magistrate Judge Hussmann has set a schedule in this matter (Docket No. 29), and

the parties are directed to comply with that scheduling order.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: 12/14/2010

Hon. Tanya Walton Pratt, Judge

United States District Court

Southern District of Indiana

-2-

Copies to:

Robert Scott O'Dell O'DELL & ASSOCIATES PC rodell@odell-lawfirm.com

COLIN M. BETTS 52490 Avanelle Street Granger, IN 46530

JILL BETTS 2417 West Bethel Ave. Muncie, IN 47304